

## Remarks

Claims 1-2, 4-13 are currently pending and claims 1, 4, 5, and 7-10 have been amended while claims 11-13 are new. Applicants assert that all claims are in condition for allowance as set forth more fully below.

### 112 Rejections

Claims 7 and 9 have been rejected as being indefinite for failure to positively recite steps. Claim 7 has been amended to be an independent claim that positively recites elements. Claim 9 has been amended to be a system claim depending from claim 8 and positively reciting elements. Accordingly, the rejections may now be withdrawn.

### 103 Rejections

Claims 1-3, 6-7, and 10 stand rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over McDowell (US Pat 6,839,554) in view of Yukie (US 2003/0031150). Claims 4, 5, 8, and 9 stand rejected as being unpatentable over McDowell in view of Brown. To the extent these rejections apply to the currently pending claims, Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections.

Initially, Applicants note that for claims 4 and 5, it would appear that the rejection should have also included Yukie since the rejection of base claim 1 required inclusion of the Yukie reference.

The independent claims now include recitations to a remote systems accessing application and a messaging application communicating via the modem to a protocol server that forwards the communications from the remote systems accessing application to remote systems containing legacy data and forwards messages from the messaging application to a message server. Such recitations are contrary to the cited references.

None of the combination of references disclose requests from a remote systems accessing application in conjunction with messages from a messaging application of a computer. Furthermore, none disclose that the requests and messages of the computer are received by a protocol server such that the protocol server forwards the requests to the remote systems while forwarding the messages to the messaging server.

Because many of the recitations of claim 1, 8, and 10 are not disclosed by the cited combination of references, claims 1, 8, and 10 are allowable over the cited combination for at least these reasons. Furthermore, dependent claims 2, 4-7, and 9 depend from allowable base claims and are also allowable for at least the same reasons. Additionally, one or more of these dependent claims include additional recitations not disclosed by the cited combination. For example, claim 5 recites that the messaging server delivers the message only when the user identifier belongs to an allowed group of recipients. Brown does not disclose that there is a determination of whether a recipient is allowed to receive messages, as merely including a recipient in a particular group is not determining that the recipient can or cannot receive messages.

Additionally, new claims 11-13 recite that the transmitting of the generated data, in the case of claims 11 and 12, and the communications over the digital packet-switched network, in the case of claim 13, occur via an X.25 protocol. None of the cited references discloses communicating requests from a remote systems accessing application and communication messages from a message application over an X.25 protocol via a wireless packet-switched modem. Accordingly, claims 11-13 are allowable for at least these additional reasons.


### Conclusion

Applicants assert that the application including claims 1, 2, and 4-13 is now in condition for allowance. Applicants request reconsideration in view of the amendments and remarks above and further request that a Notice of Allowability be provided. Should the Examiner have any questions, please contact the undersigned.

No fees are believed due. However, please charge any additional fees or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 50-3025.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: November 22, 2005



Jeramie J. Keys  
Reg. No. 42,724

Withers & Keys, LLC  
P.O. Box 71355  
Marietta, Ga 30007-1355  
(404) 849.2093